

Appl. No. 09/862,742
Atty. Docket No. AA-473
Amdt. dated May 10, 2005
Reply to Office Action of December 14, 2004
Customer No. 27752

REMARKS

Claims 1-10; and 12-37 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 23 and 26 have been amended. Claim 11 has been canceled without prejudice. Basis for amending the claims include page 14, line 14 *et seq.*

Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a) Over US Pat. No. 6,550,672
in view of US Pat. Publication 2001/0014868

Claims 1-37 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 6,550,672 (Tracy) in view of US 2001/0014868 (Herz). Without conceding to any of the points made in the Office Action and merely in the interests of expediting prosecution, Applicant overcomes this rejection in view of the present claim amendments. Applicant amends the claims, for example, Claim 1 to a dryer added sheet product or a fabric softener.

In the subject Herz passage, the shoppers MAY agree on the choice of laundry detergent (pg 12, ¶156). Applicant submits there is no motivation *inter alia* toward customizing the purchase of a dryer added sheet product or a fabric softener as now claimed in Claim 1. Applicant submits that merely because the term "detergent" is mentioned in the context of a reference that discloses a client-server system, this fact alone does not meet the requisite motivation in establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness; and even more so with fabric care products defined to dryer added sheet products and fabric softeners.

In view of the foregoing the, Claims 1-10; and 12-37 are unobvious in view of the cited references.

Respectfully submitted,

The Procter & Gamble Company

By 

David V. Upite
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 47,147
(513) 627-8150